


2000  
Consumer Satisfaction  
*for*  
**Salvation Army**  
**St. Louis**  
Community-based Services

Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse  
Missouri Department of Mental Health



Christine Rinck, Ph.D., Project Director, Consumer Satisfaction  
UMKC Institute for Human Development, a UAP  
Kansas City, Missouri

Gary Harbison, MA, DMH Outcomes Coordinator,  
Office of Quality Management

Christine Squibb, Director, Office of Consumer Affairs



*Thanks to the many people who completed the survey and to the staff of participating agencies. Thanks to the members of the Consumer Satisfaction Work Group, the Outcomes Work Group and the Performance Measurement Group.*

August 2000

# DMH Satisfaction Survey Results

## Consumer Satisfaction - 2000

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services

*Agency:* Salvation Army

## Table of Contents

Section 1. Total Agency

Section 2. Total Agency Residential

# DMH Satisfaction Survey Results

## Consumer Satisfaction - 2000

### Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services

**Agency:** Salvation Army

**Data:** Total Agency

## Demographics: Total Agency

		Total Served		Agency Survey Returns	
		State	Agency	Total Consumers Total Agency	Total Consumers Residential
<b>SEX</b>	Male	59.9%	69.1%	50.0%	50.0%
	Female	40.1%	30.9%	50.0%	50.0%
<b>RACE</b>	White	68.4%	19.5%	25.0%	25.0%
	Black	30.0%	79.7%	75.0%	75.0%
	Hispanic	0.3%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	0.4%	0%	0%	0%
	Pacific Islander	0.2%	0%	0%	0%
	Other	0.8%	0.8%	0%	0%
<b>MEAN AGE</b>				36.23	36.23
	0-17	10.7%	2.4%	0%	0%
	18-49	84.7%	92.7%	76.9%	76.9%
	50+	4.6%	4.9%	23.1%	23.1%

## Sample Size: Total Agency

Information is based on the number of returned forms and the number of people served according to DMH billing records.


	Number Served April 2000	Number Forms Sent	Number Forms Returned	Percent of Served Returned	Percent of Forms Sent Returned
Total State	9142		1972	21.6%	
Total Agency	158		13	8.2%	
<b>RESIDENTIAL:</b>					
<b>CONSUMERS</b>					
Total State Residential	1446		562	38.9%	
Total Agency Residential	35		13	37.1%	
GTS Adult	35		13	37.1%	
<b>FAMILY MEMBERS</b>					
GTS Adult		15	0		0%
<b>NON-RESIDENTIAL:</b>					
<b>CONSUMERS</b>					
Total State Non-Residential	7696		1410	18.3%	
Total Agency Non-Residential	123		0	0%	
CSTAR General	72		0	0%	
GTS Adult	51		0	0%	
<b>FAMILY MEMBERS</b>					
CSTAR General		20	0		0%
GTS Adult		60	0		0%

## Services for the Deaf or Hard of Hearing: Total Agency

The following represents the percentage of affirmative responses for each item. Item 1(a) "Do you use sign language?" reflects the percent of only those who are deaf or hard of hearing who use sign language. Item 1(b) "Did this agency have signing staff?" reflects the percentage of agencies that deaf or hard of hearing consumers identified as having signing staff available for those who use sign language.

	Overall Totals		Total Residential	
	State	Agency	State	Agency
1. Are you deaf or hard of hearing?	5.2%	0%	5.2%	0%
1(a). If yes, do you use sign language?	7.6%	0%	0%	0%
1(b). If yes, did this agency have signing staff?	17.0%	0%	13.3%	0%
2. Did this agency use interpreters?	8.3%	0%	9.4%	0%

## Overall Satisfaction with Services: Total Agency




*Program Satisfaction: Percent of responses to the question "How satisfied are you with the services you receive?"*

### Some of the key findings were:

- Overall, 79.3% of the individuals served by the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their services.
- The percent of individuals served by this agency who rated it as "satisfied" or "very satisfied" was lower than the state average (75.0% for this agency versus 79.3% for the state).
- The total State Residential Program had a rating of 77.1% as "satisfied" or "very satisfied". This agency's Residential Program was rated slightly lower, with 75.0% at least "satisfied".

## Service Means Comparison of 1998, 1999 & 2000: Total Agency



### Comparison of 1998, 1999 & 2000 Mean Ratings

Some of the key findings were:

- The mean satisfaction with services rating for this agency was 4.33 in 1998, 3.81 in 1999 and 4.33 in 2000.
- The mean satisfaction with services rating decreased in 1999 and increased in 2000.

## Satisfaction with Services: Total Agency

How satisfied are you . . .	Total Consumers		Total Residential Consumers	
	State	Agency	State	Agency
with the staff who serve you?	4.22 (1915)	4.08 (12)	4.16 (546)	4.08 (12)
with how much your staff know about how to get things done?	4.08 (1911)	3.77 (13)	4.00 (545)	3.77 (13)
with how staff keep things about you and your life confidential?	4.21 (1919)	3.85 (13)	4.20 (548)	3.85 (13)
that your treatment plan has what you want in it?	4.11 (1907)	4.17 (12)	4.10 (542)	4.17 (12)
that your treatment plan is being followed by those who assist you?	4.16 (1898)	4.25 (12)	4.19 (543)	4.25 (12)
that the agency staff respect your ethnic and cultural background?	4.29 (1876)	4.08 (13)	4.27 (530)	4.08 (13)
with the services that you receive?	4.20 (1915)	4.33 (12)	4.14 (546)	4.33 (12)
that the staff treats you with respect, courtesy, caring and kindness?	4.07 (548)	4.31 (13)	4.07 (548)	4.31 (13)
that the environment is clean and comfortable?	4.10 (547)	4.46 (13)	4.10 (547)	4.46 (13)
with opportunities for exercise and relaxation?	3.51 (537)	3.83 (12)	3.51 (537)	3.83 (12)
that the meals are good, nutritious and in sufficient amounts?	3.81 (528)	4.18 (11)	3.81 (528)	4.18 (11)
with the childcare provided by the agency?	3.98 (43)	- (0)	3.98 (43)	- (0)
The first number represents a mean rating. Scale: 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.				

### Some of the key findings were:

- The participants in the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs were satisfied with the services they received. Only three ratings fell below a mean rating of 4.00 (1=not satisfied...5=very satisfied).
- The ratings of this agency ranged from 3.77 to 4.46. The highest rated item was that the environment is clean and comfortable. The lowest rated item was with how much staff know about how to get things done.

## Satisfaction with Quality of Life: Total Agency

	Total Consumers		Total Residential Consumers	
	State	Agency	State	Agency
How satisfied are you . . .				
with how you spend your day?	3.69 (1904)	3.69 (13)	3.56 (544)	3.69 (13)
with where you live?	3.77 (1885)	3.17 (12)	3.79 (541)	3.17 (12)
with the amount of choices you have in your life?	3.63 (1917)	3.23 (13)	3.67 (544)	3.23 (13)
with the opportunities/ chances you have to make friends?	3.82 (1907)	3.62 (13)	3.97 (544)	3.62 (13)
with your general health care?	3.80 (1872)	4.00 (12)	3.82 (533)	4.00 (12)
with what you do during your free time?	3.74 (1897)	3.62 (13)	3.60 (538)	3.62 (13)
How safe do you feel . . .				
in this facility?	4.25 (547)	4.38 (13)	4.25 (547)	4.38 (13)
in your home?	4.26 (1897)	4.00 (13)	4.19 (530)	4.00 (13)
in your neighborhood?	4.08 (1894)	3.85 (13)	3.96 (532)	3.85 (13)
<p>The first number represents a mean rating.  <i>How satisfied are you?</i> Scale: 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied.  <i>How safe do you feel?</i> Scale: 1=Not at all safe . . . 5=Very safe.  The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.</p>				

### Some of the key findings were:

- The quality of life ratings were significantly below the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse service ratings.
- The consumers served by this agency were most satisfied with how safe they feel in this facility (mean of 4.38). They were least satisfied with where they live (mean of 3.17).



# DMH Satisfaction Survey Results

## Consumer Satisfaction - 2000

### Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services


**Agency:** Salvation Army

**Data:** Total Agency Residential

## Demographics: Residential

		Total Served		Agency Survey Returns	
		State	Agency	Total Consumers Residential	GTS Adult Consumers
SEX	Male	62.9%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	Female	37.1%	0%	50.0%	50.0%
RACE	White	69.9%	15.8%	25.0%	25.0%
	Black	28.6%	84.2%	75.0%	75.0%
	Hispanic	0.1%	0%	0%	0%
	Native American	0.4%	0%	0%	0%
	Pacific Islander	0.2%	0%	0%	0%
	Other	0.8%	0%	0%	0%
MEAN AGE				36.23	36.23
	0-17	14.1%	0%	0%	0%
	18-49	81.8%	94.7%	76.9%	76.9%
	50+	4.1%	5.3%	23.1%	23.1%

# Overall Satisfaction with Services: Residential



*Program Satisfaction: Percent of responses to the question "How satisfied are you with the services you receive?"*

## Some of the key findings were:

- Overall, 77.1% of the individuals served by the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Residential facilities were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their services.
- The percent of individuals served by this agency's Residential Program who rated it as "satisfied" or "very satisfied" was slightly lower than the state average (75.0% for this agency versus 77.1% for the state).
- This agency's GTS Adult Residential Program was rated lower than the State GTS Adult Residential Program (82.5%).

## Satisfaction with Services: Residential

How satisfied are you . . .	Total Residential Consumers		GTS Adult Residential Consumers	
	State	Agency	State	Agency
with the staff who serve you?	4.16 (546)	4.08 (12)	4.31 (318)	4.08 (12)
with how much your staff know about how to get things done?	4.00 (545)	3.77 (13)	4.15 (315)	3.77 (13)
with how staff keep things about you and your life confidential?	4.20 (548)	3.85 (13)	4.33 (318)	3.85 (13)
that your treatment plan has what you want in it?	4.10 (542)	4.17 (12)	4.20 (313)	4.17 (12)
that your treatment plan is being followed by those who assist you?	4.19 (543)	4.25 (12)	4.28 (314)	4.25 (12)
that the agency staff respect your ethnic and cultural background?	4.27 (530)	4.08 (13)	4.33 (305)	4.08 (13)
with the services that you receive?	4.14 (546)	4.33 (12)	4.26 (315)	4.33 (12)
that the staff treats you with respect, courtesy, caring and kindness?	4.07 (548)	4.31 (13)	4.23 (319)	4.31 (13)
that the environment is clean and comfortable?	4.10 (547)	4.46 (13)	4.31 (319)	4.46 (13)
with opportunities for exercise and relaxation?	3.51 (537)	3.83 (12)	3.72 (310)	3.83 (12)
that the meals are good, nutritious and in sufficient amounts?	3.81 (528)	4.18 (11)	4.10 (297)	4.18 (11)
with the childcare provided by the agency?	3.98 (43)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
The first number represents a mean rating. Scale: 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item				

### Some of the key findings were:

- The participants in the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Residential Programs were satisfied with the services they received. Only three ratings fell below a mean rating of 4.00 (1=not satisfied...5=very satisfied).
- The ratings of this agency ranged from 3.77 to 4.46. The highest rated item was that the environment is clean and comfortable. The lowest rated item was with how much staff know about how to get things done.

# Satisfaction with Quality of Life: Residential

	Total Residential Consumers		GTS Adult Residential Consumers	
	State	Agency	State	Agency
How satisfied are you . . .				
with how you spend your day?	3.56 (544)	3.69 (13)	3.72 (314)	3.69 (13)
with where you live?	3.79 (541)	3.17 (12)	3.86 (312)	3.17 (12)
with the amount of choices you have in your life?	3.67 (544)	3.23 (13)	3.80 (315)	3.23 (13)
with the opportunities/ chances you have to make friends?	3.97 (544)	3.62 (13)	4.02 (315)	3.62 (13)
with your general health care?	3.82 (533)	4.00 (12)	3.92 (310)	4.00 (12)
with what you do during your free time?	3.60 (538)	3.62 (13)	3.70 (312)	3.62 (13)
How safe do you feel . . .				
in this facility	4.25 (547)	4.38 (13)	4.34 (318)	4.38 (13)
in your home?	4.19 (530)	4.00 (13)	4.19 (308)	4.00 (13)
in your neighborhood?	3.96 (532)	3.85 (13)	4.01 (311)	3.85 (13)
<p>The first number represents a mean rating.  <i>How satisfied are you?</i> Scale: 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied.  <i>How safe do you feel?</i> Scale: 1=Not at all safe . . . 5=Very safe.  The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.</p>				

## Some of the key findings were:

- The quality of life ratings were significantly below the Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse service ratings.
- The consumers served by this agency were most satisfied with how safe they feel in this facility (mean of 4.38). They were least satisfied with where they live (mean of 3.17).

## Previous Feedback

The last page of the survey offered people the opportunity to address any issues by writing in comments. These hand-written comments were copied and faxed back to your agency as they were received. The primary purposes for this action was to allow for immediate feedback from the people you serve, to give you the opportunity to make any necessary improvements, and to pass along compliments to your staff.

## Sampling Methodology

Consumer Satisfaction Forms were given to people served by ADA and CPS during April 2000. For MRDD, data was collected through interviews.

People who received services from more than one program or agency received more than one survey. Therefore, some people completed more than one survey.

While this method may not have achieved a sufficient sample size to represent the opinions of all people who receive services from each provider, the survey has provided people with an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns. Giving the majority of people who receive DMH services a quick and simple way to express opinions and concerns about service quality is a major aim of this process.

## Use of Data and Quality Improvement

The methods of data collection, the survey content and the survey results should all be considered in terms of quality improvement. The Missouri Department of Mental Health Satisfaction Survey has been designed as a quality improvement process, not as traditional mental health research.

There are two primary uses of this data. First, this data gives the Department of Mental Health an expression of the level of satisfaction of the people served by the Missouri DMH system as a whole.

Second, this data is designed to support quality improvement processes at the provider level. Each provider will have a basis upon which to compare the level of satisfaction of the people who receive services at their agency with other providers of their type and the state as a whole. This comparison makes it possible for each provider to improve the quality of the services they offer. In addition, each provider can get a clear idea of some of the issues that are important to the people they serve.

It is important to understand the context of services at each agency when interpreting the meaning of survey results. Differences in the population served at each agency, variations in service provision, and particular cultural characteristics of the community in which services take place must be taken into account as providers use this information to improve the quality of services. This report does not attempt to take into account these variations. As your agency engages in quality improvement, it is your responsibility to understand and take into account these local variations in order to make the most of the information contained within this report.

*Please forward any suggestions for improvement of the survey process to Gary Harbison, Outcomes, Missouri Department of Mental Health, PO Box 687, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. Additional information about survey results may be obtained by contacting Christine Rinck, Ph.D., University of Missouri-Kansas City Institute for Human Development, 2220 Holmes, 3rd Floor, Kansas City, Missouri 64108.*